



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,684	11/06/2000	Yves Maetz	PF990072	8282

24498 7590 06/02/2005
THOMSON LICENSING INC.
PATENT OPERATIONS
PO BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,684

Applicant(s)

MAETZ ET AL.

Examiner

Hunter B. Lonsberry

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Knee does not disclose transmitting successive versions of upgradeable dynamic summaries of an event, which are concatenated in the memory of the receiver. The transmitted information according to knee relates either to the complete event (the name of the teams, the best scorers), or some upgraded information (score by quarters , score by inning). Additionally applicant argues that the information transmitted by the broadcast network and retrieved in the receiver are displayed in different boxes of a displayed menu, and that the information is not concatenated for forming the unique information: an upgradeable summary of the event (Amendment page 8).

<http://webopedia.com/TERM/c/concatenate.html> defines concatenate as *To link together or join. For example, concatenating the three words in, as, and much yields the single word inasmuch.*

Applicant admits that Knee transmits updated information, which is appended, or concatenated to the event identifying information. As the updated information (sports scores) refers to the event itself (figures 50/52), the information is concatenated (column 43, lines 18-53) as the updated information is replaced, and not the entire event information (title, name of teams).

U.S. Patent 6,536,041 to Knudson is cited to teach concatenating successive versions of summaries, and displaying the summary in a window of a screen at the receiver.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Knee with Machida and Hindsight was used to make the combination (amendment page 12).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re*

Art Unit: 2611

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, *Knee* is relied upon for teaching the use of an updateable summary, in particular, *Knee* teaches transmission of dynamic information (score updates, period/inning/time updates). *Machida* is relied upon to teach the use of a version number. The use of a version number enables a user (or user's receiver) to track how "fresh" the received data is, and enables the receiver to see if the most recent version of the data is available. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of *Knee* and the newly cited *Knudson* reference to utilize the version attribute of *Machida* thus enabling a user to keep track of when a version of the data was received to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,2, 4-6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,589,892 to *Knee* in view of U.S. Patent 6,536,041 to *Knudson*.

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Knee discloses a process for transmitting service information in a television system comprising transmitter, which transmits data over input 11 to a receiver (figure 1),

transmitting an event (a "sports program" column 41, lines 34-60);

transmitting versions of an upgradeable dynamic summary(games scores, sports information such as updated game scores, detailed team specific information, and related interactive services etc) of the said event, the content of a current version of the dynamic summary being dependent on the content of the event occurring since the transmission of the previous version of the summary up to the instant of transmission of the current version of the dynamic summary (column 41, lines 56-59, column 42, lines 33-58, figures 48, 52);

and at the receiver 605 (figure 58),

presenting an upgradeable summary of said event being the result of concatenating of the versions within a buffer 15 (summaries are illustrated in figures 50, 52 and 54, column 43, lines 21-54, column 44, lines 16-33, column 46, lines 33-44, 56-column 47, line 18)

and at the level of the receiver of:

concatenating versions successively received in the memory of the receiver, the upgradeable summary of said event being the result of the concatenating of the versions (column 40, lines 42-55, column 44, lines 22-33, Figure 47).

Knee fails to disclose concatenating successive versions of summaries, and displaying the summary in a window of a screen at the receiver.

Knudson discloses that successive versions of a dynamic summary (updated sports scores) of a sporting event are transmitted from a real-time source to a user set top device at a regular interval (column 17, lines 26-45, 53-62, column 18, lines 4-31, figure 20), the summary information is displayed in a window (controllable ticker in figures 14a,27a/b), thus enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Knee to utilize the successive versions of the summaries and display the summary information in a window to a user, as taught by Knudson, thus enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Regarding claim 2, Knee discloses that periodically, following the occurrence of a particular situation in the content of an event, an updated version is transmitted to a user. (column 45, lines 60-column 46, line 16).

Knudson is relied upon to teach transmission of successive versions.

Regarding claim 5 and 6, Knee discloses that the retrieval of real time data occurs when a user enters a sports mode of the EPG application residing on the STB (column 46, line 46-column 47, line 18).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 9, Knee discloses a receiver for receiving service information in a television system, the receiver includes:

- receiving means for receiving events (sports games) and versions of an upgradeable summary of the said event (summaries shown Figures 50, 52, and 54, which are games scores, detailed team specific information, and related interactive services) via a virtual channel (column 44, line 66-column 45, line 16);

- means for concatenating versions successively received (column 41, lines 34-62, column 42, lines 45-53, column 43, lines 29-32, column 44, lines 22-33, column 46, line 56-column 47, line 18), the upgradeable summary of the said event being the result of the concatenating of the versions (column 41, lines 56-59, column 42, lines 33-58, figure 48, figure 50, column 43, lines 21-54, column 44, lines 16-33, column 46, lines 33-44, 56-column 47, line 18);

- memory means 18 for storing the upgradeable summary in the receiver (figure 47, column 4, lines 11-20) ;

- display circuit means 33 for displaying the upgradeable summary (figure 47).

Knee inherently transmits different versions of the real time data, as different versions of the data are required for a game being watched in real time to keep a user updated as to the current score, quarter or time remaining.

Knee fails to disclose concatenating successive versions of summaries.

Knudson discloses that successive versions of a dynamic summary (updated sports scores) of a sporting event are transmitted from a real-time source to a user set top device at a regular interval (column 17, lines 26-45, 53-62, column 18, lines 4-31,

Art Unit: 2611

figure 20), the summary information is displayed in a window (controllable ticker in figures 14a,27a/b), thus enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Knee to utilize the successive versions of the summaries and display the summary information in a window to a user, as taught by Knudson, thus enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Regarding claim 10, Knee discloses that the sports score info is presented to a user when a user enters sports browse mode (column 46, line 46-column 47, line 18).

Regarding claim 11, Knee discloses that when the data feed is accessed to provide information for a game currently in progress, microcontroller 16 causes VDG 23 to display the current score, and time remaining for a basketball, football or hockey game (column 44, lines 22-29), data is detected and extracted by VBI decoder 30a (Figure 47, column 40, lines 42-55, column 46, line 56-column 47, line 18).

Regarding claim 12, Knee discloses a transmitter for transmitting service information in a television system, wherein it comprises:

- means for transmitting an event (a sports program, column 41, lines 34-60);

- means for transmitting versions of an upgradeable dynamic summary of the said event (updated sports scores and other sports related information, figures 50, 52, and 54, column 41, lines 34-62, column 42, lines 45-53, column 43, lines 29-32, column 44, lines 22-33, column 46, line 56-column 47, line 18), the content of a current version of the summary being dependent on the content of the event occurring since the transmission of the previous version of the dynamic summary up to the instant of transmission of the current version of the dynamic summary (figure 50, column 43, lines 21-54, column 44, lines 16-33, column 46, lines 33-44, 56-column 47, line 18), the concatenating of the dynamic summaries providing an upgradeable summary of the said event (the newly updated scores provide the updated dynamic summary).

Knee fails to disclose concatenating successive versions of summaries, and displaying the summary in a window of a screen at the receiver.

Knudson discloses that successive versions of a dynamic summary (updated sports scores) of a sporting event are transmitted from a real-time source to a user set top device at a regular interval (column 17, lines 26-45, 53-62, column 18, lines 4-31, figure 20), the summary information is displayed in a window (controllable ticker in figures 14a,27a/b), thus enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Knee to utilize the successive versions of the summaries and display the summary information in a window to a user, as taught by Knudson, thus

enabling a user to track the progress of a sporting event with the most up to date information available while viewing the event.

Regarding claim 13, Knee discloses that periodically, following the occurrence of a particular situation in the content of an event, an updated version is transmitted to a user. (column 45, lines 60-column 46, line 16).

3. Claims 3, 7, 8, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,589,892 to Knee in view of U.S. Patent 6,536,041 to Knudson in further view of U.S. Patent 6,035,304 to Machida.

Regarding claims 3, 7 and 8, Knee discloses that a real time data feed may provide sports information.

The combination of Knee and Knudson is silent regarding an identifier and display of time and version information.

Machida discloses an EPG system in which the EPG data has time and data information, as well as a version attribute 130, a STB utilizes this information to determine how "fresh" the data is (column 14, lines 30-44, column 24, line 60-column 25, line 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Knee and Knudson to utilize the

version attribute of Machida thus enabling a user to keep track of when a version of the data was received to track the progress of a sporting event.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Knee discloses that a real time data feed may provide sports information.

The combination of Knee and Knudson is silent regarding a version descriptor and the values of the numbers associated two consecutive versions being consecutive.

Machida discloses an EPG system in which the EPG data has time and data information, as well as a version attribute 130, a STB utilizes this information to determine how "fresh" the data is (column 14, lines 30-44, column 24, line 60-column 25, line 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Knee and Knudson to utilize the version attribute of Machida thus enabling a user to keep track of when a version of the data was received to track the progress of a sporting event.

Machida does not disclose if the version numbers are consecutive.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of consecutive version numbers is notoriously well known in the art. For example MS-DOS versions 6.0, 6.1 and 6.2. Consecutive version numbers allow a user to easily understand the version history of an application or data record.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Knee, Knudson and Machida to utilize

consecutive version numbers in order to make it easier for a user to track the version history of the supplied data.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 571-272-7298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2611

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HBL



CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER